

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present case in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been inserted. Support for the amendments of claim 1 and 2 can be found throughout the specification as filed, including at least at pages 9-12. Claims 6, 12, and 19 were simply amended for clarification.

35 USC § 112

Claims 6-9, 12, 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and traverse. Claims 6 and 12 were rejected for improper antecedent basis. Claim 19 was rejected for utilizing improper indicia. However, without acquiescing to the rejection and solely for the purpose of advancing prosecution, the claims have been amended. In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants submit that the rejection is moot. The claims as amended fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

35 USC § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Lin et al. reference, Kellie '633, the Liu et al. reference, and the Tamura reference. Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Toda et al., JP 04-275586. Claims 1-3 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Ohnuma et al. reference. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Hariharan et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The claims recite a method for forming a rainbow security hologram. None of the references cited in these rejections disclose, either inherently or expressly, a method for forming a rainbow security hologram. Accordingly, none of these references anticipates the presently claimed invention.

The references cited in these rejections refer to various methods of forming a rainbow hologram. However, none of the cited references disclose a rainbow security hologram or a rainbow hologram that is encrypted for security purposes as claimed in the Instant Application.

The cited references do not disclose such security measures for a rainbow hologram. Therefore, the references cited under 35 USC 102(b) do not anticipate the Instant Application because they do not disclose the identical invention in the same complete detail (i.e., a rainbow security hologram) as recited in the claims of the Instant Application.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing differences, Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited in these rejections neither teach nor suggest the presently claimed methods, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Hariharan et al. in view of Lin et al., Liu et al., or Kellie '633. Claims 1 and 14-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamazaki et al., JP 05-166017, and the Aggarwal et al. reference. Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamazaki et al. and Aggarwal et al., further in view of Hariharan et al., in view of Lin et al., Liu et al., or Kellie '633. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As established above, the references cited in the rejections under section 102(b) cannot be utilized in combination for obviousness because none of the references discloses or suggests the claimed rainbow security hologram. Yamazaki et al. cannot be utilized in combination with any of the other cited references, because Yamazaki et al. teaches away from the claimed invention because Yamazaki et al. explicitly states that it is different from methods that predetermine/assign locations for color. (See Yamazaki et al., par. 10 and par. 20).

Applicants submit the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Office Action has failed to establish in the least that the cited prior art contains a motivation or suggestion to combine the references such that one of skill in the art, in view of the cited combination or references, had a reasonable expectation of successfully arriving at Applicants' claims. Further, the Yamazaki et al. reference actually teaches away from the Applicants' claims.

Claim 1 recites assigning a first color to a first location on the object and assigning a second different color to a second location on the object. (Emphasis added). Claim 14 recites a method of authenticating/verifying a color assigned rainbow security hologram. (Emphasis added). Yamazaki et al. recites that its truth distinction approach of the rainbow hologram is

“different from the external recording information of a rainbow hologram called a location and the reinforcement of the refracted light . . .” (Emphasis added, see Yamazaki et al., par. 20). Yamazaki et al. further recites that its truth distinction approach of the rainbow hologram is different from “wavelength predetermined by a predetermined optical arrangement, a location, and the reinforcement of the diffracted light. . .” (Emphasis added, see Yamazaki et al. par. 10) The Yamazaki et al. reference explicitly states that its method for forming a rainbow hologram is not the assignment of a color to a location on the object as claimed in the Instant Application. Therefore, the Yamazaki et al. references teaches away from the utilization of its disclosure with another reference to form a rainbow hologram with assigned color to a location as claimed in the Instant Application. Since Yamazaki et al. teaches away from the claimed element of the invention (assigned color location) this rejection must fail.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing differences, Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited in these rejections neither teach nor suggest the presently claimed methods, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Merchant & Gould P.C.,
Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: _____

01/23/08



Marianne R. Timm
Reg. No. 58,085

MTS:MRT:kf